# UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

*Editors*

John Haynes Holmes  Francis Neilson

## Back to Methuselah, and Forward to the Commonwealth of Man

*By* ALSON H. ROBINSON

## A Pacifist on the Pacific

*By* SYDNEY STRONG

## Bryan, Darwin and the Fact of Evolution

*By* JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

VOLUME LXXXIX  NUMBER 13

Chicago, May 25, 1922

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

# UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

## *A Journal of the Religion of Democracy*

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES *: Editors :* FRANCIS NEILSON

**UNITY Fellowship**

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
HENRY R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

**Managing Editor**

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Francis L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

**Editorial Contributors**

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

**Foreign Representatives**

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
CANADA—Sidney Snow
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
E. D. Morel
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

*"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"*

## UNITY Fellowship Associates

### BOND OF UNION

**We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.**

**The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.**

**UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.**

**Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.**

**All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.**

**Name** .....

**Address** .....

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss)_____

Address _____

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

## *Contents*

EDITORIAL—
Notes ..... 195
Back to Methuselah, and Forward to the Commonwealth of Man.—REV. ALSON H. ROBINSON ..... 197
A Pacifist on the Pacific.—Editorial Correspondence.—REV. SYDNEY STRONG ..... 200

ARTICLES—
Bryan, Darwin and the Fact of Evolution.—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES ..... 201
Honored by the American National Dante Committee ..... 206

CORRESPONDENCE—
"The Christian Science Monitor."—LONGLEY TAYLOR ..... 206

POETRY—
Shelter.—*Marquerite Wilkinson* ..... 195
To Walt Whitman.—THOMAS CURTIS CLARK .. 199
There Is Not Anything.—*Witter Bynner* ..... 199
Truth Is Eager to Be Told.—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH ..... 208

THE FIELD—
Walt Whitman Fellowship of Chicago.—MORRIS LYCHENHEIM ..... 207
American Federation of Religion.—*Curtis W. Reese* ..... 207
Near East Relief Reports to Congress ..... 207
Today in Doomed Armenia ..... 207

# UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXIX. THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1922 NUMBER 13

## SHELTER

**I had reared a roof for shelter from the sky;**
**The strong light of Heaven broke through from on high.**

**I had shut my door to keep quiet and warm;**
**The strong word of Heaven came in like a storm.**

**I had built me walls and thought that all was well;**
**The strong wind of Heaven blew on them and they fell.**

**Blessed are the shelterless unto whom are given**
**The strong light, the strong word, the strong wind of Heaven.**

*Outlook.* —*Marguerite Wilkinson.*

---

As this editorial is being written, the last obsequies are being solemnly pronounced over the defunct Genoa Conference. The significance of this event is indescribably momentous, and for this reason, we suppose, is being almost entirely missed. On the one hand, of course, it marks the definite passing of power from the Allied nations to Germany, and more especially to Russia. Ever since the Armistice, the Entente countries have been trying to consolidate their great victory in arms, and master the world to their own permanent advantage. They undertook to do this first with the League of Nations, then with the Supreme Council, then with a long series of international conferences; but they failed in each and every endeavor, and the end at last has come. O'er-reaching themselves at Versailles, they have now fallen ignominiously "on the other side." The first sign of collapse, of course, was the invitation to Germany and Russia to attend the Genoa gathering. The next sign was the German-Russian treaty, which Lloyd-George tried so desperately to use for the taming of France. Finally came the Russian "terms," presented as by a victor to the defeated at a peace-table, and the immediate break-up of the Conference in confusion and dismay. The appointment of commissions and the talk about later conferences are obviously only smoke-screens to hide disaster. The jig is up, so far as the Allies are concerned. The wicked conspiracy, inaugurated at Versailles, with the enslavement of Germany, the assassination of Austria, and the outlawry of Russia, has brought its sure reward. The Allies are through, and Russia takes the center of the stage! What is done not in Paris and London, but in Moscow, is now alone important.

---

To the thick-and-thin supporters of the Soviets, this triumph of Russia at the Genoa Conference constitutes the sole significance of this event. But to our minds there is something deeper than all this! What we see in Genoa is the passing not merely of Allied power, but of that whole world of European civilization which means to the modern man the reality of what is known as "modern times." We have no brief to present for Allied policy, which we believe has been wholly bad from the very beginning of the great cataclysm of 1914. But "the desperate remedies" so feverishly tried by the victors in the Great War since the signing of the Peace, have meant something more than a mere mad endeavor to wrest the last ounce of selfish profit and advantage from their prostrate foes. Behind all this lustful cruelty has been a certain blind instinctive struggle to save the old familiar capitalistic, imperialistic world from what had the frightful appearance of impending death. In their leagues and councils and conferences, in other words, France and England and the rest have been fighting not merely for themselves but for the whole great fabric of that civilization of which they are the several parts. This has been especially evident in the case of Lloyd-George who, if J. M. Keynes is to be trusted (see his "Economic Consequences of the Peace"), saw before the adjournment of Versailles the results of his own handiwork, and thereupon tried too late to "debamboozle" President Wilson. Ever since that black moment of foresight, the English Premier has tried every conceivable device for undoing what he himself had done, and now has reached what he knows but will not confess to be his final failure. What the War started, the amazing Peace has completed. Our world, as we have known it all these years, in Europe at least, has gone. Nothing can now avail to save it. Just how the end will come —whether by a slow process of disintegration into another "dark ages," or by another war between two newly organized balances of power, or by the vast upheaval of violent revolutions—no man can say. Equally unknown is it what new beginning will take form in Russia—out of the weltering horror of that chaos shall come a firmament which no eye can now foresee or mind conceive! We can be sure today only that we walk in darkness, and that not to us, but only to our children or even children's children, will come the light of that new day that yet shall be! That this new day shall be a better day, must be our present comfort.

---

In Leavenworth Prison today there are ninety-six (96) I. W. W. men convicted during the war of con-

spiracy to obstruct war-operations, including the draft act. If any reader of UNITY has any doubts lingering in his mind as to the basic injustice of the arrest, prosecution and imprisonment of these men, we beg him to secure the pamphlet recently issued by the American Civil Liberties Union (138 West 13th Street, New York), under the title "The Truth About the I. W. W. Prisoners," and read with care and with an open mind from cover to cover. This pamphlet is not an argument or a plea, but a presentation of facts. It states who the men are who are in prison, the story of their trials as revealed in the court records, the reasons for amnesty, and (for lawyers) the legal status of the cases. If anybody can examine this publication and not be persuaded that every last one of these federal prisoners should be released without a moment's further delay, he either cannot read, or is so mentally defective that he cannot sense the significance of facts, or is so incorrigibly prejudiced that he simply "will not see." What we have in the case of these I. W. W.'s is the last, as it was in some ways the worst, instance of the mad hysteria which seized upon the mind of America during the war period. Put behind the prison bars for no other reason than that they were guilty of holding and expressing certain opinions—"every charge of violence or sabotage has been thrown out by the courts!"—they should now be granted freedom, if not for their own sake, then for the sake of a national conscience which would gladly rid itself of the last vestige of the shame of 1917 and 1918. All conscientious objectors have been released. Now let these political offenders be released as well, that our national anthem, with its great refrain of "the land of the free," be no longer a joke among us!

---

We were guilty two weeks ago of serious error in these columns, when we said (p. 163) that it is true, "so far as Europe at least is concerned," that "all political offenders in other countries have long since been released." We want to say here of our own volition, before any of our alert, well-informed and conscientious readers call us to task, that this statement is most certainly not true—or at least is true only in the sense that Russia is not to be regarded as a part of Europe! For it is one of the supreme tragedies of this day that the government of Lenin is now crowding its prisons with thousands of men and women who are guilty of no other offense than that of independent political opinion. Only the other day we had the strange experience of reading in the newspapers the resolution passed at the recent convention of the Amalgamated, calling upon Russia to free its political prisoners! We have no more sympathy, let it be said, with tyranny in Moscow than in Washington, and we call for liberty in both places. Incidentally this confession of our mistake is not wholly unwelcome, for it gives us opportunity to point out that, in this matter of imprisonment for political offenses, Republican America and Bolshevik Russia must be classified together!

---

The sensational "labor war" in Chicago, following hard upon the exposures by the Lockwood Committee in New York, discloses a state of affairs which must be disquieting in the extreme to every friend of organized labor. The old-time trade unions are today very largely in the hands of a set of labor politicians who correspond in every particular with the politicians who dominate the party machines in our great cities. These union leaders have gained their positions of authority by a certain rude ability and courage, combined with a dogged fidelity to their class, which early won for them the confidence of the rank and file. Long since, however, they have become utterly selfish and corrupt; they exist today for nothing but the plunder which they can extort not merely from the employers and the public at large but also from the unionists themselves; and they rule with a tyranny which has successfully discouraged all opposition. Talk about the despotism of the Soviets!—it is nothing compared with the despotism wielded every day by such leaders as Brindell in New York and Murphy in Chicago. And these corrupt and brutal labor czars, be it noted, are always perfectly sound in their political and economic views! No Socialists, Bolsheviki, or "reds" of any kind, among them! Whatever vision these men may once have had, has of course long since disappeared. Their dream of labor liberation never went far beyond such comparatively trivial matters as high wages and short hours, and even these are now for sale at any time for a price. It is this which explains the utter futility of the American Federation of Labor, which is controlled by as "rotten" a "bunch" of vulgar and dishonest politicians as ever blessed the sacred precincts of Tammany Hall in its palmiest days. What is to be done, if organized labor is to save itself from destruction, is to *clean house*. It must join hands with the public in getting rid of the present "gang" of leaders, beginning with Gompers and Morrison and going right straight down to the filthy dregs at the bottom. Then, in place of these discredited outcasts, must be substituted men of the Hillman, Schlesinger, Foster type—men as incorruptible as they are fearless, who are statesmen and not politicians, who are seeking the establishment of a new industrial order and not "swag" and power from the old. At present the unions show little inclination to adopt this drastic policy—Gompers is elected every year, and when Brindell goes to prison he is supported as a "martyr!" Such stupidity cannot last much longer, however, if the unions are to last.

---

UNITY has not been in the past one of the admirers of Bishop Manning, of New York; it has differed with him on nearly every political, social and religious issue. For this reason, as well as for many others, we take

delight in praising the Bishop unreservedly for his attitude on the Prohibition question. At a time when public opinion in New York City is running strongly against the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act; when newspapers are openly and shamelessly encouraging defiance of the law and its officers; when the wealthy and socially *elite,* liberally represented in the Episcopal Church, are conspicuous among the law-breakers; when his own fellow-bishops, like Lawrence of Massachusetts, are giving aid and comfort to the liquor interests, it is no small thing for Dr. Manning to take an unequivocal stand on the side of law-enforcement. He confesses himself no theoretical prohibitionist, but there is little comfort for the anti-prohibitionists in his pronouncements. In earnest, straight-from-the-shoulder fashion, he calls for obedience to the Constitution as amended and sustained by overwhelming majority sentiment in this country, and prophecies that Prohibition as a national policy is certain in the end to serve the public welfare. Such utterance as this, at this particular moment, is religious statesmanship of a high order, and should so be recognized. It is to be noted, as characteristic of the man, that Bishop Manning has always taken his priestly office seriously. At times in the past this has seemed to us to betray him into narrow and intolerant ecclesiasticisms of the medieval type. This time it has led him to courageous public leadership—and we rejoice.

---

What a perfectly glorious thing it has been to listen to the three women who recently came to this country to represent the International League of Women for Peace and Freedom, one from Scotland, one from Germany, and one from France. One swallow does not make a summer. The appearance of these women on a common platform does not warrant us in believing that the millennium is at hand. But it is an occasion for great rejoicing all the same. If these three women can unite in an endeavor to bring peace to the world, then others can. What three can do, thousands can do. There is nothing miraculous about it. The destiny of the world is in the hands of people and not of the gods. Perhaps it is not too much to say that it is in the hands of the women! Should not those who go down into the valley of the shadow of death to bring life into the world, have the deciding voice about that life being turned into cannon fodder?

## Back to Methuselah, and Forward to the Commonwealth of Man

Sometime within the next month an extraordinary and possibly disastrous flood may be prophesied for the entire area of this country. It will be a flood of oratory and eloquence falling upon the defenseless minds of thousands of young men and women graduating from the colleges and universities of the land. To what extent will these inundating forces serve a useful purpose? How far will they go towards the removal of mental rubbish, and to what extent may they be expected to supply an attitude towards life somewhat commensurate with the complexities which these young persons must face. Let us take this situation which is as certain of development as anything which we can imagine in this life, at its simplest and most inoffensive point of contact and suggest that certain well tried moral maxims will be presented with the greatest degree of exploitation. These ethical precepts variously stated may probably be reduced to some such formulation as the following: First, get the most out of life. Second, do what you can to find out what it is all about, and Third, contribute your share towards the world's happiness and welfare. Or to reduce this entire situation to still more elementary terms, one may be fairly certain that the weight of injunction will be in the direction of "Having a plan," of knowing where one proposes to go in the path of individual or collective progress.

Now this is all very well until one comes to a realization of the fact that there are certain conditions which make such advice quite gratuitous. In fact, anything like a rational plan in the sense which is here implied is quite impossible. Something of the difficulty which confronts us is suggested in the most recent production of Mr. George Bernard Shaw, entitled, "Back to Methuselah"—a Metabiological Pentateuch, as he calls it. He begins with a graphic and unique picture of the fabled residents of the Garden of Eden. They are trying to orient themselves as regards their origin and destiny. In the course of this quest Eve gives expression to an ideal which can hardly be lost sight of without disaster. She says, "Man need not always live by bread alone. There is something else. We do not yet know what it is; but some day we shall find out; and then we shall live on that alone." The programme of the Brothers Barrabus is that life shall be extended three hundred years, and with that simple condition fulfilled, with three hundred year olds running about like school children, Mr. Shaw takes us as far as thought can reach to the year thirty-one thousand. Now the contention which seems to be fundamental to this strange mixture of fancy and idealism is that in order to plan our lives intelligently, life has got to be very greatly lengthened. Not an unfamiliar observation, since one of the commonest paradoxes of life is the fact that just as we are beginning to learn how to live, how to adjust ourselves to our limitations, how to make the most out of the meager resources at our command, how to direct our physical, mental and spiritual talents along channels which will prove most worth while—just as we are learning something about

these things, we suddenly find ourselves facing the end so far as our relation to this present state of existence is concerned. Modern science has, to be sure, somewhat lengthened the span of human life. The normal expectancy of men and women who will obey the laws of sanitation and take advantage of the discoveries of preventive medicine is considerably greater than it was fifty years ago. But there are very obvious and, it would seem, insurmountable, obstacles to any revolutionary increase in the span of life; and anything like the tenure of the fabled Methuselah is possible only in the highly sensitive imagination of Mr. Shaw.

It is at this point that one seems to see something like a justification for a lot of the unconventional conduct—and worse—which strikes such terror to the heart of the modern purist. Even these Puritans themselves will have to admit that the young people have been "handed" something that is pretty bad. Romain Rolland, in his "Clerambault," one of the most moving results of his pen, speaks for them to the effect that "to young people who have all their lives before them it is not enough to contemplate truth across a heap of corpses." Now the result of all this is that great numbers of young people are living and working merely for and in the present moment. It distresses us to see the extreme to which they will go to extract from that moment experiences which have formerly been entered into only after long years of preparation. Now some of us have become convinced, if we have any convictions at all, that there is no short cut to the establishment of the Commonwealth of Man, with all that this implies. The spiritual forces of life, beauty, imagination, sensitiveness to justice and truth, these faculties come only after long and continued application. But the young person of today, as somebody has said "just coming into maturity who has never tasted that sense of security—that rather Puritanical tenacity to plain living and high thinking, which whatever it failed to do, at least gave a chance to think things through—the young person of today never having had experiences of this sort quite naturally asks what is the use of trying to be a great artist, or musician, why should I strive to create any of these intangible forces of life when I may so soon cease to be a man."

That is a difficult question to answer. Certainly anything like the old incentive is taken away, and the futility of preaching a "plan" becomes more obvious than ever. It is hard enough to get a person to plan a thing out even under the impulse of a sporting chance that something may come of it that he can weigh and measure. But when you inculcate personal despair, and then add to it that social hopelessness which is implied in a lot of the obscurantist movements such as the Fundamentalists, and that sort of thing, it isn't easy to map out a very satisfactory perspective.

Is there anything to take the place of this difficulty which besets the seeker after a plan of life. It may take a long time to develop much enthusiasm over it but the most satisfactory compensation which at present is in sight lies in the challenge offered by the continuity of human institutions. In other words it is possible without living to be as old as Methuselah to do something towards the establishment of the Commonwealth of Man. The evidence of this continuity is seen nowhere more clearly perhaps than in our contemporary interpretation of history. Revolutions, political or religious, have never made the difference which they seemed to make to those who immediately felt the force of them, or to later generations who read into them a lot of things that were not there. Prof. James Harvey Robinson reminds us that there are no breaks in historical sequences, and that changes are very very slow. "A battle or a treaty may change a people's ruler," he says, "a great pestilence may effect their economic situation, but there is no instance of any single circumstance producing an abrupt change in more than a small portion of human habits, customs, and institutions." Prof. Robinson goes on to point out that to those who seek to fix a date for the beginning of modern times, three events have suggested themselves as plausible points of departure: The fall of Constantinople into the hands of the Turks in 1453, the discovery of America in 1492, and the posting of Luther's theses in 1517. But it is possible to demonstrate that the revival of Classical learning had been going on for many years prior to the capture of Constantinople, that in no proper sense of the word was America discovered in 1492, and that the posting of Luthers theses had very little bearing upon the course of the Reformation in Switzerland, England or France. The word of comfort which comes from such a quarter as this, therefore, amounts to saying that it isn't so easy to upset things as is commonly believed. And if this is a comforting gospel to the sort of men who have plunged us into the sort of world in which we are living today for the reason that it seems to afford security to their selfishness, it is also worth while to know that it is equally difficult to overthrow a condition of justice and fairplay, once there are crusaders enough to establish such a state.

Once again one finds compensation for our personal inability to plan very far ahead, in the methods and postulates of modern science. Fifty years ago certain principles became crystallized around the investigations of Charles Darwin, and among these principles is the corner stone of the scientific method to the effect that there is an orderly process in the creation and development of biological forms. This method maintains that instead of the expression of a passing whim on the part of a capricious creator, this apparently bewildering variety of animal and vegetable species is the result of an orderly and established process. Such a process is subject to a variety of interpretations, to be sure. You may elect the particular form which most strongly appeals to you. You may go back to Lamarck with his emphasis upon the element of adap-

tation. You may champion an original Darwinism with a belief in the transmission of acquired characteristics. You may be a follower of De Vries and stoutly maintain his mutation theory to possess that Philosophers stone whereby the baser metals of this all too solid flesh are to be changed into some finer, spiritual substance without which life may have no ultimate meaning. But whatever choice you make you are still within the scope of an orderly and rational plan. Now this plan is being called into question. Obscurantism, superstition, that betrayal of the truth which apparently attends every war has lighted upon this contribution of man's knowledge of himself, and the battle has to be fought all over again. Not the least humiliating part of it is that all this backwardness originates in the Church, or at least with religious tradition. Let the Church look to the unmistakable revolt against the dogmas of her own institutions, and then shall she be able to stand in judgment upon those of her scientific brethren. As a matter of fact all truth is one, and our understanding of life, and our ability to fit into any sort of plan whereby some constructive contribution may follow is wholly dependent upon the co-operation of truth seekers.

Now the time has come to carry this whole approach over into the great field of human contact and association. The past few years have witnessed the quiet culture of a new department of scientific research and technique, which because of its emphasis upon the impulse of man's gregariousness, has come to be known as social science. For its method of approach this youngest of the sciences is deeply indebted to the inductive method of natural science. Obviously many experiments, stock in trade for the biologist, are wholly unavailable for the social scientist. There are no social laboratories, as such. You cannot deliberately experiment with the institutions of the family, the sovereignty of the state, or the right of private property. Our prejudices and preconceptions preclude this, even if it were possible or desirable. But you can bring intelligence instead of ignorance, calmness and poise instead of superstition and prejudice, to bear upon the problem of living together happily and with mutual helpfulness. "When men act on the principle of intelligence," says Mr. Walter Lippman, "they go out to find the facts and to make their wisdom. When they ignore it they go inside themselves and find only what is there. They elaborate their prejudice instead of increasing their knowledge."

On rare occasions one finds something like an application of this principle to situations of great urgency. A few days ago a significant meeting was held in New York under the auspices of the Russell Sage Foundation, for the planning of a great metropolis for the next century and for all the ages. The conception of city planning is by no means new, and while not all the details of New York in 2022 as foretold by Mr. Root may be completely to our liking, the method of an independent investigation of social forces seems not to be wholly foreign to this ambitious enterprise. The tender solicitude with which Mr. DeForest delicately announced that the officials of the city had not been asked to approve the plan for a study of the future, for fear of embarrassment to both the officials and to the movement, is not without significance.

Well, here is enough to stagger the most optimistic product of our institutions of learning. History, science, sociology—they have laid bare the whole scheme of man's task, and challenged him to work out his destiny. Beside them counsels of moral perfection fade into insignificance, for the reason, as previously suggested that our opportunity to apply them is in most cases prematurely cut off. It need not be so in the establishment of the Commonwealth of Man. The materials are all at hand. We may, if we will, avoid the disasters which befell our ancestors. Even the so called acts of God need have no terror for him who reads the book of the new Revelation. "And though all that they have done," says Lilith, in the closing of Mr. Shaw's essay, "seems but the first hour of the infinite work of creation, yet I will not supersede them until they have forded this last stream that lies between flesh and spirit, and disentangled their life from the matter that has always mocked it."

ALSON H. ROBINSON.

---

### TO WALT WHITMAN

You had no zest for lilting roundelays
Of perfumed love and highly spiced romance;
Your thought was anchored in the wide expanse
Of universal being. Let the praise
For slender songs and sonnets be to those
Who know not high adventure, smug, content
To be within life's study-windows pent,
Past which no wind of great emotion blows.
Your thoughts were tidal, and your dreams were drenched
With seas tempestuous and thunder-rocked.
Your arm with Neptune's arm was interlocked
As you strode—then as now—with youth unquenched.
No idle singer of an empty day,
You hold, with sun and stars, your cosmic way.

THOMAS CURTIS CLARK.

### THERE IS NOT ANYTHING

There is not anything
I would not do,
Just to be journeying
Again with you.

There is not anything
I would not be,
To have you journeying
Again with me.

But nothing I can do
Or be will bring
A word or sign from you,
Not anything.

*—Witter Bynner.*

# A Pacifist on the Pacific

Editorial Correspondence

The white man's first task and duty is to get right with the colored races. A visit to the Fiji Islands is a case in point.

I am now on my way from Suva to Auckland, N. Z. Of New Zealand I shall write in my next letter. For the moment I am interested in an Indian deputation, appointed by the Indian government to investigate labor conditions in the Fiji Islands. I consider myself fortunate to be a fellow-passenger with the members of this deputation, which consists of Mr. V. Raju, chairman, who is a member of the Legislation Assembly of India; Mr. G. S. Sharma, who is a member of the Legislative Council of United Provinces of Agra and Oyth; Mr. G. F. Corbett (Englishman) of the Indian Civil Service; Lieut. Hissamuddin, of the Indian British army. The latter, an Indian, came along, I am told, to determine whether Fiji is a suitable place for locating soldiers. (If Japan were doing this, what with the new attorney-general being a distinguished artillery expert, an uproar would go up all over America.)

In sending you information about the Fiji situation and the deputation, I hope you will understand that the readers of UNITY are getting news which would cost a metropolitan daily paper a dollar a word! Let no one think, however, that the deputation has unbosomed itself to me, before making report to the Indian government, whose servants they are. However, they are cultured gentlemen and talk freely of India and Indian affairs. One of them asked me how Indians behaved when in the United States (he had heard uncomplimentary reports) and I assured him that they were very circumspect.

What was the reason for the deputation? This is the story. In 1879 the planters of Fiji were not satisfied with their labor. They said, as the white man has always said, untruthfully, "the natives will not work. They are too lazy." (As a matter of fact, if you look out the window anywhere in a tropical country you will see colored people doing the work—with a white man, occasionally, bossing.) The planters thereupon made arrangements for the importation of Indian laborers on the indenture plan—the Indian government approving of the enterprise.

Here is where the bad business began. It was not infrequently accompanied with deceit and intimidation and the laborers were a simple-minded, illiterate class, easily imposed upon by the recruiters. There were comparatively few women, just enough to constitute an immoral and unspeakable situation. The laborers "signed" a contract to remain five years. If they went back then, they paid their own way home. As it was impossible to save up enough in five years to pay for the return passage, they were compelled to stay ten years, when the government was to pay the passage. I am told that several thousands are entitled to free passage, but the government has not found it convenient to carry them.

In February, 1920, there were over 60,000 Indian laborers in the Fiji islands. (There are about 75,000 Fijians.) They were getting one shilling and sixpence a day (30 cents). The cost of living had doubled over pre-war prices. Accordingly, they struck. This strike lasted thirty days. On account of nervousness and bad judgment on the part of officials "riots" occurred. Gunboats, with marines, came up from New Zealand and Australia. The strike collapsed.

A year later, a second strike occurred, as before, for a higher daily wage. This lasted for six months, when the government appealed to the strikers to return to work, on promise of an investigation. The work of the deputation is part of that investigation. The strikers went back to work. The planters raised the daily wage to two and six (50 cents); but, strange to say, after the arrival of the deputation, put it down again to one and six (30 cents). This is generally regarded as a lockout on the part of the planters, and unfortunate, coming as it did, while the investigation was in progress.

The planters say they can not afford to pay more than one and six. They are referred however to the big dividends and enormous bonuses they have paid during the past seven or eight years.

Practically everybody admits that one and six is an impossible daily wage! Everyone says that the indenture system is a failure; in fact, it was abolished in Fiji in 1916. Which leads me to add that indentured labor has been a failure in S. Africa, Australia and now in Fiji. Still, the U. S. Congress is being importuned to permit the importation of 5000 Chinese laborers into Hawaii. Why not learn from the failure of British experiments? The indenture system is bad morally, politically, racially, religiously, industrially. It is a clear case of exploitation of weaker people, for the sake of the greedy. A profane Britisher said about the Fiji situation, "If the sugar business can't pay more than one and six, then let it go to ——."

The situation at Suva is not encouraging. The Fijian native population is decreasing, unquestionably affected by the arrival of the white man. The Indians are increasing, but are showing ability to take care of themselves. They are reflecting the activities of affairs in India itself. They will not work for one and six, and they should not be expected to do this. White men are beginning slowly to see that exploitation and greed debase the exploited, who in turn debase the exploiters.

The last thing I remember about Suva (Fiji), as our steamer made ready to depart, was a group of several hundred Indians, on the dock, bidding farewell to the deputation, with formal addresses. I observed them closely. They are not like the Fijians, who are more like big children. The Indians have back of them a hoary and distinguished civilization, which has enriched the world. Their cause is that of simple justice. I said to myself, What a shame that white men have so disturbed the peace of the world, as to make this deputation necessary! The time has arrived for white men to quit their domineering and greedy exploitation!

As I said at the beginning of this letter, the white man's first task and duty (let him forget the "burden" business) is to get right with the colored races. Fiji is a case in point. I thought also of Haiti and S. Domingo, and lastly of Pango Pango, our one sub-equatorial colony, where a Congressional committee might find material for investigation.

*S. S. "Niagra," April 6.* SYDNEY STRONG.

# Bryan, Darwin and the Fact of Evolution

It seems to me an astonishing fact that a minister should stand in his pulpit in the year 1922 and enter upon a discussion of the old issues of the evolution controversy. I feel a certain sense of humiliation in asking you to consider with me the problem of Darwin and his discoveries, and very real surprise that so many people should think it worth while to come together to consider so antiquated a theme. What is there in evolution to discuss at this late day? What controversy is there that was not settled a half century ago? What can we expect to gain by threshing over this subject afresh? "The Origin of Species" was published on October 1, 1859, over sixty-two years ago. As early as 1876 John Fiske, our great American scientist and philosopher, wrote in his "Cosmic Philosophy," "that evolution is a permanent acquisiton of knowledge. Whatever else the philosophy of future generations may be, it must be some kind of a philosophy of evolution." In 1880, when English scholars celebrated what they called "the coming of age" of "The Origin of Species," Thomas Huxley declared "that evolution is no longer a speculation but a statement of historical fact. It takes its place alongside of those accepted truths which must be reckoned with by philosophers of all schools." In 1909, which was at once the one hundredth anniversary of Darwin's birth and the fiftieth anniversary of the publication of his immortal book, scientists everywhere throughout the world joined in a spontaneous tribute to the great Englishman's memory and a fresh affirmation of the abiding truth of his discoveries. It was on this occasion that Professor Kellogg, one of the ablest of living biologists, said "evolution is regarded to be as proved a part of biology as gravitation is in the science of physics." Lastly, there is that important statement by Alfred Russel Wallace, second only to Darwin himself among the great scientists of his day, who said shortly before his death, "evolution is now universally accepted as a demonstrated principle, and not one single writer of the slightest eminence that I am aware of, declares his disbelief in it."

Such statements, which might be multiplied indefinitely from the most authoritative sources, would seem to close the controversy upon this subject. Yet controversy has been opened and is now being conducted with a furious intensity such as the world has not known since the earliest days of the evolution period. Hundreds of ministers in this country are standing today in Christian pulpits disputing evolution and affirming the truth of the old mythology of Genesis. Recently the attack on evolution has broken the barriers of the churches and is being organized as a great popular movement which threatens to sweep the country from end to end. At the head of this movement stands Mr. William Jennings Bryan, a great orator, a true democrat, an ardent champion of international peace, a man who has long deserved well of his fellow-countrymen and is certain of a distinguished place in American history. Such leadership bodes serious results, for Mr. Bryan if only because of his transcendent oratorical abilities is able to catch the public ear and sway the public mind. What we have here is one phase of that astounding intellectual reaction or reversion which has followed upon the close of the Great War. Just as spiritualism in its crudest and most superstitious forms is now bewitching the lives of millions throughout the world, just as the old theological phantasmagoria of the "second coming" is again convulsing the thoughts of men in many of the greatest denominations in Christendom, so this old and almost forgotten campaign against the evolution theory has been revived and is now gathering amazing momentum. What we have before us is evidently a period in which old ghosts must again be laid, old errors again revealed, old truths again demonstrated. What Wallace, Huxley and Spencer proved fifty years ago, we must now prove once more. For like the Pharaoh that knew not Joseph, there has arisen a generation which knows not Darwin. This task, however necessary, must be a melancholy and toilsome one. Ours is the labor of Sisyphus! For years we have been climbing the rocky slopes of knowledge and enlightenment, and at last in the opening years of this century seemed about to reach the radiant summit of true civilization. Then came the War, and we went tumbling again to the bottom; and here we are, lost in the gross darkness of our tragic fall. It seemed for a time as though we could never rise again, but at last men are stumbling to their feet. Before us, however, are the long slopes which must be climbed again. The labor, as I have said, will be a bitter one, and the burden of fear, ignorance and hate which we must push ahead of us will be heavy; but there is nothing to do but to press on with patience and abiding faith.

In order to understand the problem of evolution as first presented by Darwin and as now attacked by Mr. Bryan, we must return to the year 1831 when Darwin, then a young man of twenty-one years of age, set sail as official naturalist on H. M. S. *Beagle*. At that time there were just two possible explanations of the origin and development of life upon this planet. The one was the theory of arbitrary creation at the hand of an omnipotent God at one precise moment in the past—the theory set forth in the opening chapter of Genesis and amplified with such marvelous poetic vigor in Milton's "Paradise Lost." According to this theory, all of the natural world was made suddenly to spring into being by the fiat of God, exactly as we see it at the present moment. Centuries have gone by since that day of creative miracle, but the earth and the sea, the flowers and the trees, the birds and the animals, all exist now exactly as they were manufactured on that first morning of the planet's life. This theory of creation was accepted by all the great scientists of the day. Cuvier gave to it his great authority in France, Sir Charles Lyell in England, and Louis Agassiz in America. These men accepted this doctrine, it should be noted, not because there was any scientific evidence to give it standing; no such evidence existed, or ever has existed down to the present moment. But in the absence of any evidence of any kind bearing upon the question, such an explanation was the only plausible hypothesis which could be advanced. It was taken for granted in the absence of anything better.

There was a second theory, however, which had long been in existence, and this was the theory of evolution. I suppose most people think at the present day that Darwin invented or discovered the idea of evolution. As a matter of fact nothing could be farther from the truth. Evolutionary theories are as old as

the earliest philosophers of Greece, and a recent history of the doctrine covers a span of no less than twenty four hundred years. Somehow or other men have never been able to get away from the thought of evolution, largely because, I imagine, they have always seen the process of evolution going on before their face and eyes. Every time a child is born and grows from infancy to manhood, we see an illustration of evolution. Every time a seed is dropped into the earth and develops into a flower or a tree, we behold what evolution can do. From remotest times men have found themselves confronted by the fact of development, and on the basis of this fact they have builded all kinds of more or less fantastic theories. In the closing years of the eighteenth century, the idea of evolution was presented as a definite scientific hypothesis by a group of men, among whom Buffon, Lamarck, and strangely enough, Erasmus Darwin, the grandfather of Charles, were the most distinguished, who laid down the proposition that the present state of things in the natural world has been evolved by a natural process of development from a series of antecedent states. Life, they argued, has been moving through unnumbered ages from simpler forms to more complex, from lower to higher, from the oyster to man. This, of course, sounds not unreasonable today, but at the time of which we are speaking (1831) this evolutionary theory had no standing among intelligent and educated men. The scientists whom we have named had done their best for the idea, but in the absence of all evidence in its support had failed completely to make the doctrine convincing. Within the period of a generation, it had completely disappeared from the scientific mind. Huxley tells us that "in the ranks of the biologists at this time, he met with nobody who had a word to say for evolution." Outside these ranks, he continues, he knew of only one person whose knowledge and capacity compelled respect and who was at the same time a thoroughgoing evolutionist. This was Herbert Spencer, whose early essays on the subject anticipated Darwin's work by a period of years. Creationism, and not evolution, was the true dogma of the day. "As I look back at the state of knowledge at that time," writes Huxley, "I really do not see that any other conclusion was justifiable."

It was under these circumstances that Darwin set sail upon the *"Beagle,"* and thus began a voyage as memorable in the annals of science as the voyage of the *"Santa Maria"* is memorable in the annals of history. I have no time this morning to tell the story of Darwin's experience on this long journey down the eastern coast of South America, up the western coast and across to the islands of the Pacific. To those of you who desire to know these facts and at the same time read one of the most fascinating stories of adventure ever written, I commend Darwin's own account of the trip in his book entitled "The Voyage of H. M. S. Beagle." Suffice it for me to say at this time that it was while he was investigating the flora and fauna of the various countries visited, that he began to notice certain phenomena which did not seem to harmonize with the universally accepted idea of creation. As he multiplied his observations and accumulated his mass of data, he became more and more perplexed, and at last found himself convinced against his will that the creation hypothesis was simply impossible and that the theory of evolution must be true in some form or other. Throughout the remainder of the voyage the problem haunted his mind like a ghost—he was not able to shake it off. Finally, on returning to England in 1836 he made the great decision of his life—namely, to devote his career to the investigation of this particular problem.

For twenty years with ceaseless devotion and unremitting patience, Darwin pressed his inquiry. He read exhaustively in natural history, especially the books of the old evolutionists of the Lamarckian school; he corresponded with naturalists in all parts of the world; he gathered specimens of various kinds of life from a great variety of countries and climes; he cultivated flowers and bred pigeons and carried on innumerable experiments in his private laboratory. How long he would have continued his work before announcing his conclusions to the world we do not know. But in 1858 there occurred an event, one of the most remarkable coincidences in history, which made necessary the presentation of his facts to his fellow-scientists. It was in this year that Darwin received from Alfred Russel Wallace, a young naturalist known to him only in the most casual way, and at that time exploring on the extreme other side of the world in the Malay Archipelago, a memorandum setting forth a theory of evolution by "descent through modification." Unknown to Darwin, this man Wallace had discovered the same facts that he had discovered years before in his voyage on the *"Beagle,"* and had worked out a theory in explanation of these facts which was so closely identical with that which Darwin had formulated, that the one was hardly distinguishable from the other. It is this memorandum which gives Wallace his place in history as co-discoverer with Darwin of evolution. As soon as this paper was received, Darwin coupled with it an essay of his own which had been written some years before, and presented both to a meeting of the Linnaean Society. Then, with Wallace's full approval, he set himself to the task of preparing his material for publication in book form. A year later, in 1859, he published his "Origin of Species," a book which marks the opening of an epoch in human thought and which will ever be remembered as one of the few supremely great works of all time.

Darwin and his book accomplished two things, both of which I desire to emphasize this morning.

In the first place, "The Origin of Species" presented the facts which prove the idea of evolution to be true. Up to this time these facts had not existed, so far as the observation and knowledge of men were concerned. Of course they had always been present here in the world, but no one had seen them until Darwin saw them, or at least no one had seen them with eyes that read and understood their meaning. In this sense Darwin's work was absolutely original, and remains as one of the colossal achievements of the human intellect, parallel in every respect with Newton's feat of demonstrating the truth of gravitation. Of course, since Darwin's day, certain of his facts have been modified, and all have been supplemented by an incalculable array of new facts which have been observed by the great multitude of scientists who have followed in his footsteps, but Darwin's data, like Columbus's discovery of San Salvador, still stand as basic. These facts, made known by Darwin and his successors, involve such a mass of data that no one mind can know them, much less use them. Mr. Bryan, in his attacks on evolution, constantly asks for facts to prove the doctrine to be true. It is almost inconceivable that any man today can be so ignorant as

not to know the existence of such facts. In every library in the land there are scores of shelves which groan under the weight of books which contain and describe them in detail. All Mr. Bryan has to do is to go into any modern library, or biological laboratory, or natural history museum, and he will find in abundance what he pretends to be looking for, but which, I sadly suspect, he is the last man in the world who really wants to see.

It is of course impossible for me to present even a tithe of these facts which demonstrate, to quote again the words of Huxley, that evolution "is no longer a speculation but a statement of history." I desire, however, to touch upon three areas of knowledge in which certain facts are classified, and thus show you what some of these facts are and what they mean. I shall refer briefly in turn to embryology, physical anatomy and paleontology.

Embryology is of course the science which deals with the conception and development of the embryo. If we turn, now, to the development of the human embryo from the first microscopic cell to the fully-fashioned body of the infant when born, we find revealed the whole story of the evolution of earthly life through the ages of the past. Each embryo, that is, reproduces in the mother's womb the life history of the world. In the beginning, it is nothing but a single minute cell. As it develops through succeeding weeks and months, it presents no slightest indication that it is human in either origin or destiny. On the contrary, until the last stages of its growth are reached, the embryo appears to be that of an animal, or rather that of different animals at different times. Thus in the beginning, after it has broken the limits of the cell, it presents the appearance of a worm, having no head, nor neck, nor backbone, nor waist, nor limbs. Next it passes through one after another of the higher invertebrate forms, and during these developments not even the trained scientist can tell whether the embryo is animal or human. Then comes that wonderful moment when the first marking of the backbone appears, and the observer knows that the embryo at last belongs to the vertebrate class of animals; but whether a human, or something much lower than the human, he still can not tell. Then comes that remarkable succession of forms in which the embryo is first a fish, then a serpent, then a bird, then a mammal, until at last there appears the monkey stage, marked by the fact that the embryo is possessed of a lengthy tail. Finally, in the last few weeks of its hidden life within the womb, there appear the first indications that a human being is in process of development—on the one hand an enlarged brain, which gives capacity for thought, and on the other hand, a larynx, which makes possible the faculty of speech. These are the facts of embryology, and these facts show that man in his embryonic form is a reproduction, or recapitulation, of all previous natural history. The human embryo, in other words, bears the marks of its ancestry, and lives over again in epitome the experience of the ages. From the standpoint of the doctrine of creation, the embryological story is absolutely incredible; it is a mystery which cannot be solved. From the standpoint of evolution, however, it is a story which tells its own tale. It is as though Mother Nature presented within ourselves this vast procession of the lower forms of life, in order that we might know whence we came and understand the elements of which we are builded.

Secondly, there are the facts which are to be found in the field of human anatomy, those facts which have well been called "the scaffolding of the body." Here all through these bodies of ours, is the evidence of our descent from the animal creation—evidence which tells the story of our origin as clearly as the inscriptions upon an Egyptian pyramid tell the story of its building. For instance, the distinctive mark of the fish, of course, is its delicate and beautiful apparatus for breathing which we call the gills. Now it is a wonderful fact that the gills of the fish are still represented in the human neck, proving conclusively man's aquatic origin. Thus children are sometimes born with open gill-slits in the neck just below the ears, open inside and outside so that milk taken in at the mouth flows out on the shoulders. Somewhat more common is to have the original position of the gills plainly marked by small patches or ridges of white skin. Those of us who bear no such abnormalities carry one evidence which is universal—namely, the ear, which is nothing but a development of the first or upper gill-slit of the fish. As though to prove this, nature occasionally puts the ears in human beings halfway down the neck, instead of in their normal position. Mention of the ears brings us to another proof of our animal origin which is to be found in these little organs. Thus we know that to erect and move the ears is a power possessed by all animals. Man, of course, does not erect or move his ears in this fashion, for he has outgrown the habit; but it is interesting to note that the muscular apparatus for this purpose is still attached to our ears as to the ears of the dog or the horse. This apparatus has become atrophied through disuse, but it is there all the same, and occasionally there appear human beings in whom the power of moving the ears still remains. Thus I remember a schoolboy friend of mine who was able to wiggle his ears, to the huge delight of his fellows and the great exasperation of his teacher! Mention of these muscles brings me to a still more astonishing piece of animal "scaffolding" which has been left in our bodies, and one which should greatly interest Mr. Bryan, who seems so disturbed at the possibility of his having descended from a monkey. If Mr. Bryan would do what Sidney Smith said once on a very hot day in England that he wanted to do—namely, take off his flesh and sit in his bones, he would discover that he bears, as a gentle reminder of simian days, a rudiment of a tail! At the end of his spinal column, in other words, he would see four or five vertebrae curving outward in a most suggestive fashion. At first he might be tempted to deny that this is a relic of the cordal appendage; but if he would put on his flesh again, he would make the amazing discovery that, clustered about these vertebrae, are certain muscles which once had the business of wagging this tail. And so I might go on, running over the various bones and organs of the body showing their affinities with the animal past. Wiedersheim, the great naturalist in this field, has shown that the human body contains more than one hundred and eighty of these vestiges of animal descent. Right in the structure of our physical organism, in other words, just as in the embryo, are the evidences of the age-long development of life. Take away the theory of evolution, and there is no explanation of these phenom-

ena. Accept this theory, and their meaning is apparent. What we have been, we still are!

Lastly, let us to turn to the field of paleontology, which has to do with fossil remains. It is in this field of investigation that we find an accumulation of facts which constitute final demonstration of the truth of evolution. I refer, of course, to the remains of extinct animals firmly imbedded and thus preserved in the soil, which show us the exact forms through which the evolution of life has proceeded from age to age. Let me give three illustrations of the marvels which are revealed by paleontological investigation. In the Slavonian lake region in Europe there are some dried up fresh water lakes, which were once densely populated by snails. As these little animals perished from generation to generation, their shells sank to the bottom of the lakes, became imbedded in the mud and debris, and thus perfectly preserved. This went on for millions of years, each succeeding generation of snails dying and depositing their shells on the top of the preceding generation,—the most ancient, of course, at the bottom, and the most recent at the top. Now a deep shaft has recently been sunk through the petrified soil of these dried-up lakes, and it has been found that the shell deposits constitute a perfect series of changing forms, the ones at the top being so different from those at the bottom, as to constitute a wholly different species. Yet as the series of shells is followed from layer to layer, they seem to grade into one another so imperceptibly that there is no point where it can be said that the one species leaves off and the other begins. A second remarkable illustration is that of the fossil horses, of which the most famous specimens are the Marsh collection in the Museum in New Haven, and the Whitney collection in the Museum of Natural History in this city. These horses were dug up from the rock deposits of certain of our western states, and present a complete history of the *genus* horse. The Marsh collection, for example, shows thirty stages in the development of the horse family, from a four or five-toed ancestor about the size of a fox, which lived some two million years ago, to the present superb animal that we see today. These skeletons are as positive a demonstration of the evolution of this one animal as are the ruins of Pompeii of the existence of that old Roman city. Denial is as impossible in the one case as in the other. Lastly, there are the fossil remains of human beings all of which have been discovered since the days of Darwin and which supply the famous "missing link" for which he was looking in his time. I wish I had the time this morning to describe the famous ape-man found in Java, the Heidelberg man found in Germany, and the Piltdown man found in Sussex, England. Suffice it to say that these three meagre specimens show on the one hand the ape already moving to the status of manhood, and on the other hand the man who has not yet thrown off the obvious characteristics of the ape. Here in skulls, jaw-bones, and thigh-bones is the record of our ancestors, the men from whose loins we have sprung, and they show a kinship with the monkey as indubitable as their kinship with ourselves.

It is facts such as these, multitudinous in number and variety, which demonstrate the fact of evolution. To Charles Darwin, as we have seen, belongs to the immortal distinction of having discovered these facts and interpreted their meaning to the world. It is this achievement, constituting his first great contribution to human knowledge, which makes the publication date of "The Origin of Species" the close of one vast epoch of history and the opening of another. But there is a second achievement which must be credited to Darwin's researches as presented and formulated in this work. I refer to the fact that Darwin not only discovered the data which proved evolution to be true, but worked out as well a theory which explains how the process of development had taken place. It was the total lack of such a theory or explanation, as well as the total lack of material evidence, which had persuaded all naturalists before Darwin's day that evolution could not be accepted as a sound interpretation of earthly phenomena. Now when Darwin succeeded in demonstrating that on no other hypothesis than that of evolution could the facts of life be understood, he was at once confronted by the question of explaining this hypothesis. The process of development had apparently taken place, but how? The stream of life had been flowing on from form to form, but under what impulse had it moved and by what power had it been directed It was easy enough to see how changes were brought about in the life of domestic animals and plants, for this had been achieved for centuries by a process of arbitrary selection in breeding. Dogs, cats, horses, cattle, sheep, pigeons, cereal and culinary plants, fruits and flowers, all these had been modified in a hundred different ways by the ingenuity of man in selecting those types which he wanted to preserve and throwing away all the others. What had thus been achieved in the breeding of domestic animals and the growing of cultivated plants, by a method familiar to the rudest breeder on the remotest farm, had apparently been accomplished in the great world of nature at large, but, in the absence of man as a controlling factor, how could such evolution be explained? There must be some principle of selection in the process, but how was it even conceivable that in the world which grew wild, so to speak, there could be any selective factor at work?

It was this mystery which had remained unsolved for years—which indeed had appeared so baffling that scientific men had definitely given it up. Not only was there no evidence that evolution had taken place, but it was intellectually inconceivable that it could take place. But just as Darwin found evidence which no man had seen before, so he now worked out a theory to explain this evidence which no man had ever dreamed of before. It is perhaps in the discovery of this principle that the real greatness of Darwin must be said ultimately to consist. "It was here," said John Fiske, "that the poetic and creative act of genius came into play, just as it did in Newton's discovery when the fall of the moon was likened to the fall of the apple." There came a day when Darwin saw that in the natural history of plants and animals, life tends to multiply much faster than it is possible for the earth to furnish sustenance. This unrestricted multiplication results in a competition for the means of existence. Of the mulitude of plants and animals produced, only a few in any generation can survive and reproduce their kind. These few, of course, who thus survive what is a terrific struggle for subsistence, are those which are the strongest, or at least the best adapted to the environment in which they are placed. There is a "natural selection," that is, in the untamed world of nature, which is just as effective as man's artificial se-

lection in the world of domestication. It is the remorseless struggle for existence which selects the few to survive and the many to perish; and it is this "natural selection," or "survival of the fittest," as Herbert Spencer preferred to call it, which explains the process of evolution. Just as man in his breeding of dogs or pigeons, or in his growing of orchids or chrysanthemums, selects the best and allows them to propagate, destroying all the rest, so the strugle for survival among the rapidly multiplying species and varieties of organic life selects those which are best and allows them to propagate, and in the same way destroys the remainder. Thus are constantly created new species and new varieties. Nature does naturally, that is, what man's ingenuity does artificially; but in either case the same determining factor of organic development is present. To his array of evidence in demonstration of his thesis, Darwin thus added an explanation of the how and why of the process which the evidence proved to be true. It was this latter step, following upon the first, which raised the evolution theory from the rank of a brilliant but unfounded philosophical speculation to the rank of an irrefragable scientific discovery. What wonder is it that, with two such complementary and decisive intellectual achievements to his credit, the name of Charles Darwin, by the common consent of enlightened minds, is placed side by side with such names as Aristotle in the ancient world and Newton and Descartes in the modern?

Such are the two things which were achieved by Darwin in his immortal work, "The Origin of Species"!

Now we come to an important distinction between these matters which goes a long way in explaining the many misunderstandings which have accompanied discussions of evolution from the beginning, and which lie at the bottom, I believe, of so much of the present attack upon the doctrine as is really honest and sincere. Of the fact of evolution, as I have said, no man today who knows anything makes dispute. Every scientist, in every department of learning throughout the world, who has any standing of any kind, agrees that evolution is true and accepts this doctrine as the basic fact upon which the whole edifice of modern knowledge is reared as a foundation. The same thing cannot be said, however, of the theory of "natural selection," as an explanation of the fact of evolution. This theory is not by any means accepted universally by modern scientists as the final word in the discussion of the problem. That it is a factor in determining the evolutionary process is generally agreed; but that it is the only factor, or even the decisive factor, is quite as generally disputed. Since Darwin's day, in other words, new facts have led to the formulation of new explanations. De Vries's discovery of "mutations," for example, while confirming the fact of evolution in a most impressive manner, has nevertheless presented this fact in a wholly new light and led to interpretations which go far towards discrediting the adequacy of the Darwinian principle. Now, in order to avoid confusion in the discussion of these two aspects of the evolution problem—on the one hand the fact, and on the other the theory to explain the fact—scientists have coined the word "Darwinism" to describe briefly the whole theory built upon the idea of "natural selection" and have agreed to use the simpler word "evolution" to describe the process which all know has been going on since the beginning of the world. "Darwinism," therefore, is one thing, and "evolution" is quite another. "Darwinism," as a theory or explanation of the process of life, might be wholly discredited, as it has, as a matter of fact, been greatly altered and extended, without touching the fact of evolution at all. So true is it that "evolution" is a thing apart from "Darwinism," and "Darwinism" a thing apart from "'evolution," that I believe that all of Darwin's distinctive work might be cast away as outgrown and worthless, and the doctrine of evolution still remain unimpaired. Says Professor Kellogg, referring to this very point, "Darwinism might be on its death bed without shaking to any considerable degree the confidence of biologists and natural philosophers in the theory of descent (or evolution)."

Now, it is this all-important distinction between "Darwinism" and "evolution" which a man like Mr. Bryan knows absolutely nothing about. It is for this reason that he talks so glibly about "Darwinism" being dead and "evolution" being disproved. It is true that every now and then a distinguished scientist in some part of the world, discussing the causes and controlling factors of the evolutionary process, rises up to say that "Darwinism" is inadequate or untrue. By this, of course, he means, as all his fellow scientists well understand, that the idea of "natural selection" is not satisfactory as an explanation of the developing forms of life which have crowded this world in infinite variety for aeons past. Mr. Bryan, however, in his simplicity or ignorance, at once takes it for granted that the scientist in referring to "Darwinism" is, of course, talking about "evolution," and thereupon cites this scientist as authority for his declaration that the whole doctrine of evolution has been discredited, and is even now repudiated by the world of learning. At bottom, of course, this is the sin of bearing false witness. The fact that Mr. Bryan does not know he is bearing false witness makes it easy for us to forgive him and thus think gently of his faults; but this does not alter the disastrous consequences of what he says. What Mr. Bryan is today engaged in the miserable business of spreading in the public mind misinformation which he ought to be more ashamed of than the so-called monkey origin from which he shrinks. It seems to me to be rather creditable than otherwise that a man should be able to trace his origin to the animal world and thereby prove the amazing progress which he has achieved in ages gone; but there is nothing but what is utterly discreditable in a man's loading himself down with errors which he ought to know to be errors, and peddling them about to an unsuspecting public as honest wares.

I doubt, however, even if Mr. Bryan and his associates were properly instructed as to this distinction between "Darwinism" and "evolution," whether they would be willing to abandon the campaign upon which they are at present engaged. In the last analysis, after all, Mr. Bryan hates evolution not because of any false ideas he has about it. His hostility and fear —for his hostility has its origin in fear—spring from the simple fact that there is no reconciliation between evolution on the one side and orthodox Christian theology on the other. Between the Bible, the creeds of Christendom, etc., and this fact of evolution, there is utter incompatibility—and Mr. Bryan knows it! He sees with perfect clearness that if evolution is accepted as true, men must give up the Bible as the infallible

word of God, throw overboard the creeds as the statement of human origin and destiny, and abandon the church as the appointed medium of spiritual salvation. This does not mean, as well-informed men and women very well know, that the acceptance of evolution is inconsistent with religion, or even with the ideas that are central to religion. The evolutionist may believe in God, the soul, immortality, the moral law, and sacrifice no slightest particle of his intellectual integrity. Mr. Bryan proclaims that evolution and atheism are synonymous. To such charge the one, as the simplest, answer is, that it is untrue. Among all the classic evolutionists, whose labors established the doctrine in the minds of men, I know of not a single one who was an atheist. Many of them were agnostics in the high and reverent sense that they were unwilling to affirm that they knew everything that might be known about God and his world; but such confession of ignorance is a very different thing from out-and-out denial. Herbert Spencer's affirmation of the ultimate First Cause is one of the sublimest philosophical generalizations in the history of the human mind. Alfred Russel Wallace's philosophy of the divine element in human nature—namely, the soul—is perhaps his most distinctive contribution to modern thought. John Fiske's interpretation of immortality and the everlasting reality of religion has placed him among the leading religious, as well as scientific, leaders of our time. Evolution is not only consistent with the fundamentals of religion, but strengthens and illumines them. What must go in the face of this great discovery of Darwin is not religion, but theology—the dogmas of the fall of man, the divinity of Jesus, the atonement, the resurrection, the infallibility of the Bible, the authority of the church. It is these discredited doctrines, born of an age of ignorance and superstition, and not religion at all, that Mr. Bryan is really interested in. And it is not only because he fears but knows, by some kind of unescapable instinct, that this whole structure of theology is shaken to the ground by the earthquake of evolution, that he is today entering upon his desperate campaign. It is from this point of view that we are made to see that there is, after all, nothing that can be done with Mr. Bryan and his ilk. They are not so much fighting evolution as defending Christian theology. This they have a right to do; but the rest of us have an equal right to discredit forever an interpretation of God and his world which is attested untrue and immoral, and turn to the newer and infinitely nobler religion which constitutes not the least of Darwin's contributions to human life.

It is this last fact, which I have referred to all too inadequately, which I would leave with you as my final word this morning. Evolution is true and it is consistent with all that is enduring and precious in the religious consciousness of man. The religion of evolution is a phrase that I love, for it expresses correctly the spiritual faith of the modern man. What we see in the process of evolution is God's method of work; what we see in the progress of evolution is God's fulfillment of His holy purpose; what we see in the life of evolution is the revelation of God's spirit immanent in the world of matter and of man. One of our own American poets has summed it all up in the lovely stanza of a famous poem—

"A first-mist and a planet,
A crystal and a cell,
A jelly-fish and a saurian,
And caves where the cave-men dwell;
Then a sense of law and beauty,
And a face turned from the clod,
Some call it Evolution
And others call it God."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

## "The Christian Science Monitor"

Editor UNITY, Chicago, Illinois.

In your April 6 issue, UNITY "bemoans the fate that has fallen upon *The Christian Science Monitor*," and says a great deal upon the subject. Among other things UNITY would intimate that The Christian Science Board of Directors was instrumental in turning out of office various members of the *Monitor* staff. It would also intimate that the dissociation of the paper from its recent staff had destroyed the morale of the *Monitor*.

In the first place, it was disobedience to the By-Laws as contained in the Manual of The Mother Church which put out of office some malcontents who either resigned to the Trustees of The Christian Science Publishing Society on their own acount or awaited a court decision which accepted their resignations. The Manual of The Mother Church was upheld by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts as the final authority on all questions pertaining to church government.

I am grateful to announce that *The Christian Science Monitor* is founded upon a basis which personality cannot overthrow. It is not so much a question of who the editor-in-chief may be, as it is a question of obedience to right which will keep the *Monitor* in its place—a clean, truthful and successful newspaper.

I am forwarding a recent copy of the *Monitor* for your perusal.

Thanking you for the courtesy of printing this correction for the benefit of your readers, I am

Sincerely yours,

LONGLEY TAYLOR.
Christian Science Committee on Publication for Illinois.

## Honored by The American National Dante Committee

Among the five private citizens of the United States to be awarded the medal of the House of Dante of Rome, is the friend and supporter of UNITY, Luigi Carnovale, author and publicist. Mr. Carnovale gave himself generously to the work of interesting Italians of this country in the plan of presenting to each of the leading American Universities and Libraries, numbering seventy, as well as to the Library of the White House and to the Congressional Library, the magnificent copies of the volumes, containing the original manuscript of Dante's Divine Comedy—The Codice Trivuliiano, and two hundred and twenty volumes containing the entire works of Dante. Two of those who share with Mr. Carnovale the honor are Warren G. Harding and Charles Evan Hughes. The Chicago University, University of the State of New York and Vassar College won the medal by virtue of conspicuous collections of Italian books and treatises.

---

Observing three stone-cutters at work, a stranger asked the first, "What are you doing?"

"I'm working for seven-fifty a day," he said.

"And you?" he asked of the second.

"I'm cutting this stone," growled the laborer.

When the question was put to the third stone-cutter, he answered,—

"I'm building a Cathedral!"

## THE FIELD

*"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"*

### WALT WHITMAN FELLOWSHIP OF CHICAGO

The annual celebration in honor of the poet's birth will be held Wednesday evening, May 31st, 1922, at the Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, corner Langley Avenue. It is fitting we meet at theAbraham Lincoln Centre because the Centre was founded by the late Jenkin Lloyd Jones who, like Whitman, will ever be recognized as an elemental force in furthering Love, Comradeship and Justice.

The dinner will be at 6 p. m., the celebration at 8 p. m. Admission to the dinner and celebration will be $1.25. Separate admission to the celebration, twenty-five cents. There will be short addresses by the following speakers:

Carl Sandburg, the poet of democracy.

Dr. Andrew A. Gour of the Editorial Staff of "The Chicago Daily News."

Ellen FitzGerald, teacher and translator. Miss FitzGerald, who attended the Whitman Celebration in Paris, will give us first hand information of the estimation of Whitman in France.

Francis Neilson, publicist, writer and lecturer.

Clarence Darrow, lawyer, writer and lecturer.

Rev. Preston Bradley, Minister of the Peoples Church.

Julian B. Arnold, writer and lecturer. Mr. Arnold will give reminiscences of the visit of his father, Sir Edwin Arnold, to Walt Whitman.

Llewellyn Jones, Literary Editor of "The Chicago Evening Post."

Expressions of the dear love of comrades will follow from other speakers.

Rev. Walter H. Macpherson, Minister of the Universalist Church of Joliet, Illinois, will act as Chairman.

Songs by Rene S. Lund.

Marion Lychenheim at the piano.

Reservations should be made to Dr. Morris Lychenheim, 142-39 S. State Street. Telephone Dearborn 4936.

Reservations cannot be accepted for the dinner after Tuesday, May 30th.

MORRIS LYCHENHEIM,
*Secretary.*

### AMERICAN FEDERATION OF RELIGION

The time has about come, if indeed it is not past due, for the formation of an American Federation of Religion. This federation should be based on *perfect liberty in the quest for pure religion.* Its purpose should be (1) To make religion effective in the life of the world, (2) To provide a fellowship beyond the lines of creed and sect, (3) To maintain a clearing-house of information and inspiration, (4) To function in forms of co-operative effort for which there may now be no adequate provision. Its membership should include individuals, local organizations, and general associations. It should contain departments of religious education, of social relations, of publication, of personnel, and of community religion. At the head of these and any other departments should be the best equipped men procurable. In basis, purpose, and program the American Federation of Religion should be such as to catch the imagination, win the respect of the intellect, and stir the motor impulses. To participate in the bringing into being of such a movement is the greatest challenge offered to modern religion in America.

The initiative in this movement should probably be taken by The National Federation of Religious Liberals, which organization together with the Free Religious Association, the American Secular Union and any other similar organizations, should merge into the more inclusive Federation. The movement should have the wholehearted affiliation of all Unitarian, Universalist, Ethical, Liberal Hebrew, Independent, People's, and Community Church organizations and general bodies. At least 100,000 individuals who are not situated so as to participate in any local religious organization of a free nature should, and no doubt would, give such a Federation their co-operation and support immediately.

The question arises, why should not some one of the existing organizations, especially the National Federation of Religious Liberals, be made to function as above indicated? The answer is that this new deal in religion should not be hampered by any title which suggests old line controversies. In its beginning it should not be embarrassed by a history. And besides, all constituent elements should be in on the ground floor, especially is this true of the Community Churches which are rapidly becoming vital forces in the religious life of the country. The greatest possible care should be taken to see that no group hands down a ready made plan but that all worthy projects are integrated into a splendid co-operative program.

This association would be to the free and independent religious organizations of America what the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ is to the Evangelical churches, and in addition it would be potently an all inclusive Federation, for just as rapidly as the orthodox churches become willing to unite with others on the basis of perfect liberty in the quest for pure religion they too would belong in the Federation. If any existing general religious organization were willing to commit its ability and its resources to the fostering of such a movement as here suggested that organization would write its name forever on the pages of religious history as an illustrious example of greatness through service and of the immortal paradox "He who loses his life for a great cause shall find it."—*Extract from Annual Report of Rev. Curtis W. Reese, Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference.*

### NEAR EAST RELIEF REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

As Near East Relief operates under charter from the United States Congress it is the duty of its secretary to make an annual report to that body. The report for the past year, recently submitted, accounts for disbursements of a total of more than $50,000,000 since the organization was formed in 1915, in addition to the large contribution made by one individual toward the expenses of administering this great relief undertaking. The amount also includes flour to the value of $12,800,000 secured through the United States Grain Corporation and American Relief Administration, but disbursed through the agency of Near East Relief.

The bringing together of this large sum of money for relief work has been made possible through the contributions of approximately 20,000,000 individuals. More than a thousand American citizens have been engaged in relief operations in the Near East, of whom 230 are at present residing in the various relief centers in Armenia, Georgia, Turkey, Syria and Palestine. Many of these American workers are volunteers, giving their services either without financial consideration or on a minimum maintenance basis.

They include physicians, surgeons, nurses, mechanics, industrial experts, agriculturists, teachers, engineers, orphanage experts, supply, transportation and general relief workers. They care for more than 100,000 orphans, giving them such opportunities for school work as is possible with the handicap of practically no facilities or equipment. They also train them in various lines of agricultural and industrial work in order that these children may be able to earn a livelihood when they become old enough to be dismissed from the orphanages. Some industrial work is carried on for the purpose of giving self-supporting employment to war-widows who are endeavoring to make new homes and keep their children together.

There are at least 1,000,000 people, chiefly Armenians, living today who would have perished had it not been for American relief.

Near East Relief maintains 38 hospitals besides 59 clinics. Forty nurses with their native assistants supervise the sanitary work and care for the health of the orphans and refugees of these famine and politically disturbed areas. Special hospitals have been established for the treatment of tuberculosis and of trachoma, that dread disease of the East which is the cause of so much blindness. The results of the treatment of this disease, as well as the campaign for its prevention, have produced most satisfactory results.

In the Russian Caucasus the government has allocated to Near East Relief 17,600 acres of agricultural and grazing land which will be used in developing an increasing measure of self-support among the people as well as furnishing agricultural and industrial training for the orphans of that section.

There can be no question that the money now being used to save the lives of children and to train them will, like any investment in childhood and education, richly bless the world, strengthening international good will for decades and centuries to come.

### TODAY IN DOOMED ARMENIA: FRESH HORDES OF HOMELESS.

The evacuation of Cilicia has been followed by a fresh flood of Armenians from their homes. The following extracts from the New Near East (New York) describe the conditions:

"Two hundred thousand Cilician refugees now scattered through Beirut-Constantinople areas;

"Mersine shore crowded with refugees awaiting transportation to Cyprus and Syria;

"Ten thousand Armenian refugees with many children arrived Beirut; thousands Tripoli, Tyre, Sidon."

American workers in the field write:

"The problems in this district are now complicated by the hangover of relief. Thousands of Armenians are coming here from Adana, Tarsus, Mersine, etc. Some 2,000 Armenian refugees were landed here last Thursday. Many have passed on to other towns, especially Damascus, about 500 are sheltered here in tents, on low, wet ground, and others, perhaps 150, are sheltered only by the overhanging cover of a freight-house. Others are in the open, and at this moment a cold rain is falling. Those who are stranded here have very little money and only such clothes and equipment as they can carry."

"It is easy to preach, but the Near East workers are more 'fed up' than the American public. Here we see things at close range. We see the careful, laborious work of several years suddenly go to smash. The French evacuated Cilicia—suddenly most of the Christian population have abandoned their property and have left for other inhospitable shores, and Near East Relief has another life-sized problem on its hands. No one wants refugees any more. Constantinople will not receive them.

"Just imagine yourself a refugee! You, like many of them, come from refined people who have never known want. Suddenly you find yourself homeless, your property gone, the future all unknown; you may be hungry, cold, for winter is here. Such a condition in itself is bad enough, but add to it one more thing, which is worse than all—a knowledge that you are unwanted. In place of sympathy, you see cold, indifferent looks, averted faces. The man in the street doesn't want you; he is 'fed up.' Only Near East Relief, and a few other similar but smaller organizations, are ready to help and to sympathize.

"When you hear anyone say that he is 'fed up' with helping the Armenians, just ask him to imagine himself a refugee, a homeless, helpless and hopeless refugee, a man, perhaps, with a wife and several children looking to him for daily bread."

---

## TRUTH IS EAGER TO BE TOLD.

All there is for man to know
Waits until the mind shall grow
Worthy of it—clean and clear—
Whereupon Truth must appear.

Truth is eager to be told
Unto spirits true and bold;
But to coward hearts and weak
It were vain for Truth to speak.

Oracles of God are dumb
Until cleansed and strong we come,
Resolute to be and do,
Not alone to know the true.

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.

---

***Subscribe for and read UNITY! Do not miss a single issue.***


**Only By the Abolition of Neutrality Can Wars Be Quickly and Forever Prevented**

***An Original Conception for the Practical Advent of Universal Perennial Peace and Brotherhood***

*Price 25c.* By LUIGI CARNOVALE Author of *Why Italy Entered Into the Great War, etc.* *Price 25c.*

IT.-AMERICAN PUBLISHING CO. : - : 30 N. Michigan Blvd., Room 930, Chicago

WRIGHT & COMPANY

*STEAM—DOMESTIC*

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028

Main Office:

28 E. Jackson Blvd.

CHICAGO

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Bowman Dairy Company

*MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY*

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

*DREXEL State Bank*

**Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.**

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor—large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

*Your savings and checking account cordially invited*

***Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars***

Schumann & Company

*Cleaners of*

*Fancy Gowns and Kid Gloves*

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

Phone Drexel 0231
All Departments

MAIN OFFICE AND WORK:
*3954 Cottage Grove Avenue*